REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-27, 29, 31-33 and 35-49 are currently pending
- Claims 31 and 45-47 are canceled herein
- Claims 1, 17and 33 are amended herein
- Claims 48 and 49 are new claims

[0003] Claims 1 and 33 have been amended to clarify what comprises an event notification by eliminating options of which an event notification can be drawn from that were previously presented. As such, no new matter is added via the amendments presented herein.

[0004] Support for the amendments to claim 17 is found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0076]-[0079]. Additionally, claim 17 has been amended to incorporate elements and features of claims 31 and 35.

[0005] Support for the new claims 48 and 49 can be found at least at paragraph [0033] and Figure 6. As such, no new matter is added via the addition of these additional claims. Further, these claims are allowable as the art of record fails to teach or suggest enumerating the local and remote credentials multiple times responsive to multiple different events.

Claims 45-47 Comply With § 112 2nd Paragraph

[0006] Claims 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0007] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein cancels claims 45-47 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these cancelations render the § 112, ¶ 2 rejections moot.

Claims 1-4 and 11-16 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

[0008] Claims 1-4 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0009] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claim 1 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 101 rejection moot.

Cited Documents

[00010] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Burch: Burch et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0171872
- Brovick: Brovick et al., "Windows 2000 Active Directory", New Riders Publishing, 2000, Chapter 10 pp 1-8

- Grambihler: Grambihler et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,655
- Yianilos: Yianilos et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029214

Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29, 31-33 and 35-44 Are Non-Obvious Over Burch in further view of Brovick and in further view of Grambihler

[0010] Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29, 31-33 and 35-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Burch in further view of Brovick and in further view of Grambihler. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0011] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 1 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler. Applicant submits that the combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

> 1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:
>
> storing, in a memory, instructions for performing the method;
>
> executing the instructions on a processor;
>
> according to the instructions being executed:
>
> enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to receiving a first event notification, **wherein the first event notification comprises a lock event;**
>
> based on the enumerating, evaluating the local credentials and the remote credentials; and
>
> based on the evaluating, synchronizing the local credentials and remote credentials.

[0012] Claim 1 recites in part, "wherein the event notification comprises a lock event." The Office cites Grambihler, Summary of the Invention as teaching synchronization can be performed in response to logon and logoff events. (Office Action, page 5.) Grambihler does not describe synchronization can be performed in response to a lock event.

[0013] Consequently, the combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-16

[0014] Claims 2-16 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-16 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 17

[0015] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 17 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler. Applicant submits that the combination of Burch Brovick and Grambihler does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

17. (Currently Amended) A computer readable storage media encoded with a computer program for executing on a computer system a computer process, the computer process comprising:

enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to receiving an event notification, **wherein the event notification comprises an unlock event** and **wherein the credential comprises at least one of the following:**

a token;

an XrML license;

synchronizing the local credentials and remote credentials via a synchronizing module, wherein the synchronizing module:

sorts the local credentials and the remote credentials into a local credential array and a remote credential array respectively and linearly compares the local credential array and the remote credential array; and

stores a state file for conflict resolution, the state file comprising:

a file version;

a flag, wherein the flag indicates whether the credential is user-protected; and

a credential state, wherein the credential state comprises:

last time synchronization module called;

last time local store changed; and

last time remote cache changed;

based on the synchronizing module comparing the local credential array and the remote credential array,_removing at least one of the local credentials from a first local credential cache associated with a first device, wherein the credential removed from the first local credential cache is identified and tagged by the synchronization module in a remote credential cache;

based on the synchronizing module comparing the local credential array and the remote credential array, removing the tagged credential from a second local credential cache associated with a second device,

wherein the first device is different than the second device, without rewriting the tagged credential to the remote credential cache; and

handling errors, wherein error handling comprises returning a write state indication of a status of a credential write operation, wherein the write state indication consists of one of the following:

a none indication, wherein the none indication comprises an indication that the credential was not altered;

a partial indication, wherein the partial indication comprises an indication that the credential was partially altered; or

a done indication, wherein the done indication comprises an indication that the credential was successfully changed.

[0016] Claim 17 recites in part, "wherein the event notification comprises an unlock event." The Office cites Grambihler, Summary of the Invention as teaching synchronization can be performed in response to logon and logoff events. (Office Action, page 5.) Grambihler does not describe synchronization can be performed in response to an unlock event.

[0017] Additionally, claim 17 has been amended to recite that the "the credential comprises at least one of the following: a token; and an XrML license." The Office cites Burch, paragraphs [0022]-[0024] as teaching that the credentials include at least one of the previous listed credentials. (See Office Action, page 12, in rejecting claim 35). Burch, paragraphs [0022]-[0024] states:

> [0022] A credential store is a file, database, directory, or combinations of the same which houses confidential information and identity information about one or more principals. The confidential information is defined by attribute fields that identify a type of confidential data; each attribute field is populated with specific attribute values which

identify the values associated with confidential data.

[0023] A credential store also includes identity/authentication information and or authentication techniques or services associated with authenticating principals vis--vis other principals. In some cases the identity information is a legacy identification and password pair. In other cases, the identity information is a certificate or an assertion, such as a SAML or Liberty assertion that identifies what identity information is needed to authenticate and how that authentication is to take place.

[0024] The credential store also includes policies that define how attributes can or cannot be processed in a given principal-to-principal relationship. The authentication information, authentication techniques/services, attributes, and policies combine to form credentialing information records that populate the credential store. Furthermore, a credential store need not reside contiguously within storage or memory. That is, a credential store can be logically assembled from a variety of other identity stores residing in a plurality of remote storage and memory locations.

[0018] Burch teaches that the identity information can comprise legacy identification and password pair, a certificate or an assertion. (See Burch, paragraph [0023]). Burch does not teach or suggest that the credential comprises at least a token or an XrML license.

[0019] Finally, the cited combination Burch, Brovick and Grambihler does not teach or suggest handling errors wherein "error handling comprises returning a write state indication of a status of a credential write operation" as is presently claimed by amended claim 17. Further, the cited combination of art fails to teach that the write

state indication consists of either a none indication, a partial indication or a done indication.

[0020] As noted by the Examiner, the combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler does not teach or suggest that the synchronizing included error handling. (See Office Action, page 10). As such, the cited combination cannot disclose the specific manner in which error handling is now presently claimed by independent claim 17. Support for these amendments can be found at least at paragraphs [0076]-[0079] of the present application.

[0021] The combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim as presently amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 18-27, 29 and 32

[0022] Claims 18-27, 29 and 32 ultimately depend from independent claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 18-27, 29 and 32 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 33

[0023] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 33 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler. Applicant submits that the combination of Burch, Brovick and

Grambihler does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

> 33. (Currently Amended) A system comprising:
>
> an event handler to receive event notifications; and
>
> a synchronizing module operatively associated with the event handler to synchronize local credentials and remote credentials when the event handler receives an event notification and if the local and remote credentials are different from one another, **wherein the event notification is at least one of the following:**
>
> **a lock event; and**
>
> **an unlock event.**

[0024] Claim 33 recites in part, "wherein the event notification is at least one of the following: a lock event; and an unlock event." The Office cites Grambihler, Summary of the Invention as teaching synchronization can be performed in response to logon and logoff events. (Office Action, page 5.) Grambihler does not describe synchronization can be performed in response to a lock or an unlock event.

[0025] Consequently, the combination of Burch, Brovick and Grambihler does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 35-44

[0026] Claims 35-44 ultimately depend from independent claim 33. As discussed above, claim 33 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 35-44 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an

allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0027] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/ Dated: 2009-07-15
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090